

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in light of the aforementioned amendments and following remarks. The amendments introduced are entirely within the merits of the application and were rendered necessary because of the new prior art submitted by the applicant which was not known at the time of the last response by the applicant. The amendments conform to CFR 1.116 (c).

In the last Office Action claims 10, 12-22 and 24-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olive et al (USP 4,093,852)(Olive) and as well by Reichman (USP 4,908,584). Currently, claims 58, 61-63, 65-68, 70-72 and 73-87 are pending.

Claim Rejection due to Reichman (USP 4,908,584):

The examiner asserts that Reichman teaches a solid state device that shows picture frames containing a light sensing region and a light emitting region scanned by a laser beam for each picture frame displayed, in the presence of an applied electric field by causing charge carriers to flow from the light sensing region to the light emitting region. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion. The invention by Reichman is that of a light modulator (Col. 3 line 66 to Col. 4 line 18) that has a light sensing surface **yet no light emitting region**. There are two incident light sources on the device. One type of incident light is absorbed by the light-sensing region. This light absorption causes a voltage change across a liquid crystal layer that decreases the amount of rotation experienced by the second type of incident light as it passes through the liquid crystal layer. This decrease in rotation modulates the light passing through the liquid crystal layer. As is entirely clear, from a complete traversing of Reichman's invention, there is **no light emission** of any kind involved. Thus, the applicant submits that Reichman does not constitute a basis for a prior art of record that is pertinent to the applicant's invention.

Claim Rejection due to Olive (USP 4,093,852):

The examiner asserts that Olive teaches a solid state device that shows picture frames containing a light sensing region and a light emitting region scanned by a laser beam for each picture frame displayed, in the presence of an applied electric field by causing charge carriers to flow from the light sensing region to the light emitting region. The applicant submits that this teaching of Olive does not teach the limitations of the applicants invention. In Olive's invention light emission takes place due to the excitation of phosphor particles by alternating current passing through dielectric layers only (Col 1, lines 35-67). In comparison, in applicant's invention, the light emission takes place due to process that involves generating a current due to laser scanning a photosensitive region which leads to recombination of holes and electrons in a LED. Furthermore, Olive does not teach the concepts of frame and frame period, crucial to modern image display technology. These concepts are an integral part of applicant's invention. Moreover, alternating current (AC) is used in Olive's invention whereas no AC current is used in applicant's invention's. **Most importantly**, the invention of Olive does not teach or even suggest a **monolithic composition** of the device (see descriptions of figures 2 and 3 in Olive) as explained in applicant's invention. In the applicant's invention a monolithic composition as depicted by figure 10 (page 14 lines 1-18) is in contrast to figures 3 and 4. The laser addressing the monolithic composition is incident on a monolithic photosensitive region (a monolithic photocell) of the device and in the end causes a light emission from a corresponding region or pixel of a monolithic photo-emissive region (monolithic LED *see abstract*) such that the area and location of the pixel is defined by the incident laser. For one skilled in the art this is significantly different as an invention from the embodiment described for figures 3 and 4 where the laser is incident on predefined regions or pixels that emit light later. The applicant contends that these differences set the two inventions significantly apart and therefore Olive does not inhibit patentability of applicant's invention.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that all currently pending claims are allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Raja Singh Tuli
Inventor